QUALITY REPORT

Saracbendi Hpp Run-Of-River Hydro Project

VCS-758 · VCS · Türkiye

Report ID: CM-C92FD1EA · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

6.4 Overall Score out of 10	
Integrity (35%)	6.2
Transparency (25%)	6.8
Claim Safety (25%)	5.8
Documentation (15%)	7.4

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

This is a grid-connected run-of-river hydro project under VCS with additionality confirmed by the VVB and no reported material findings or corrective actions in the extracted record. However, multiple cross-document inconsistencies (notably in credited ERs, grid emission factor, and crediting period) and weak/unclear leakage treatment increase over-crediting and reliability risk.

Project Details

Registry	Verra (VCS)
Registry ID	VCS-758
Sector	renewable_energy
Country	Türkiye
Vintage	Aging
Project Methodology	ACM0002 21.0
Crediting Period	2021 — 2031
VVB	LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)
Verified ERs	176,224 tCO2e
Monitoring Period	2019 — 2022
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	21 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Large discrepancy in reported verified/claimed ERs between older and newer validation reports (83,794.5 vs 176,224), raising data reliability concerns
- Leakage treatment is inconsistent across documents (deemed negligible vs not addressed) despite a 0% leakage deduction

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 6.2 / 10

+ The validation/verification record indicates additionality was confirmed by the VVB using an investment test (validation report).

- Leakage is taken as 0% while justification is inconsistent and, in the latest monitoring extract, not addressed (monitoring report 2023).

Additionality appears reasonably supported: the validation report indicates an investment test and that additionality was confirmed by the VVB (Applus+). Baseline setting is project-specific under ACM0002 and the baseline was last reassessed in 2020 (monitoring extract), which is a positive but still less robust than a standardized/jurisdictional baseline. Leakage is deducted at 0%, but the monitoring report (2023-03-31) does not address leakage while the validation report (2023-03-22) deems it negligible, weakening confidence in the leakage conclusion.

Transparency — 6.8 / 10

+ Claimed and verified ERs match in the extracted record for the latest cycle (176,224 vs 176,224) and no material findings/corrective actions are reported (validation/monitoring extracts).

- Key parameters and periods are inconsistent across documents (grid emission factor and crediting period), reducing MRV clarity (validation vs monitoring reports, 2023).

The extracted record provides a clear monitoring period (2019-08-01 to 2022-05-31) and shows no material findings or corrective actions (monitoring/validation extracts). Claimed and verified ERs align for the latest figure shown (176,224 vs 176,224), which supports MRV consistency within that cycle. Transparency is reduced by conflicting core values across documents, including the grid emission factor (0.4616 in the monitoring report vs 0.5491 in the validation report) and conflicting crediting period dates across monitoring reports.

Claim Safety — 5.8 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing aviation-claim channel risk (registry extract).

- Over-crediting risk is elevated by contradictory ER totals and differing grid emission factors across core documents (validation vs monitoring reports).

The project is marked as not CORSIA-eligible, which lowers the risk of high-impact aviation claims. However, claim safety is undermined by contradictions in the ER totals across validation reports (83,794.5 in 2013 vs 176,224 in 2023) and by differing grid emission factors between the 2023 validation and monitoring reports, both of which can materially affect credited volumes. Leakage is also a claim-safety concern because a 0% deduction is applied while the justification is inconsistent (validation report vs monitoring report 2023).

Documentation — 7.4 / 10

+ A relatively complete document set is referenced (PDD, monitoring report, validation report, issuance) with 17 documents used and high extraction confidence.

- Safeguards-related statements change materially between older and newer monitoring reports (2013 vs 2023), indicating record inconsistency.

Documentation coverage is fairly strong: the extracted evidence includes a PDD, monitoring report, validation report, and issuance records, with 17 documents used and high extraction confidence. The VVB is identified (LGAI Technological Center, S.A. (Applus+)), supporting audit traceability. Nonetheless, safeguards-related disclosures (safeguards mention, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing, and FPIC) differ between the 2013 monitoring report and the 2023 monitoring report, which weakens confidence in the continuity and completeness of the documented social safeguards narrative.

Risk Indicators

● **Additionality**	VVB-confirmed investment test
● **Permanence**	Avoidance project; no reversal risk flagged
● **Leakage**	0% deduction with inconsistent justification
● **Baseline**	Project-specific baseline; reassessed in 2020
● **Safeguards**	Safeguards/FPIC reported but inconsistent over time
● **Double-claim**	Not CORSIA-eligible; CCP status not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Provide a clear reconciliation note across versions explaining why ER totals, grid emission factors, and crediting period dates differ between the 2013 and 2023 documents, and which values govern issuance.

→ Add explicit leakage assessment text in the monitoring report (even if negligible) consistent with ACM0002 requirements, and publish/append supporting calculations and parameter sources for the grid emission factor used.

Documents Reviewed

- Issuance Representation
- Monitoring Report
- Communications Agreement
- Registration Representation
- Project Description
- Verification Representation
- Validation Representation
- Verification Report
- Validation Report

Report ID: CM-C92FD1EA · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy